

# Exhibit 24

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Brent Caslin (Cal. Bar. No. 198682)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West Fifth Street  
Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213 239-5100  
Facsimile: 213 239-5199  
bcaslin@jenner.com

Terrence J. Truax (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael T. Brody (*pro hac vice*)  
Gabriel A. Fuentes (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
353 N. Clark Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456  
Telephone: 312 222-9350  
Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
ttruax@jenner.com  
mbrody@jenner.com  
gfuentes@jenner.com

*Attorneys for Mitsubishi Electric, Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

In Re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust  
Litigation

Case No. 14-cv-2058 SC

MDL No. 1917

This Document Relates To:

DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

**MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC DEFENDANTS'  
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DIRECT  
PURCHASER PLAINTIFF WETTSTEIN AND  
SONS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF  
INTERROGATORIES TO MITSUBISHI  
DEFENDANTS**

Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Mitsubishi Electric Corporation (“MELCO”), Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc. (“MEUS”), and Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc. (“MEVSA”) (collectively, the “Mitsubishi Electric Defendants”) hereby supplement their response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.’s First Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants (“DPPs’ Interrogatory” or “DPPs’ Interrogatories”), served upon the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants by the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs (“DPPs”) on December 19, 2014. This supplemental response incorporates the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants’ prior response from January 20, 2015.

### **GENERAL OBJECTIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL INTERROGATORIES**

1. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories, definitions, and instructions to the extent they purport to impose requirements beyond or inconsistent with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court’s Local Rules, or any other applicable rule or Court order.

2. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and oppressive due to the significant burden and expense of responding to the Interrogatories and because the Interrogatories seek information that is not within any of the Mitsubishi Electric Defendant’s possession, custody or control, given that the information sought concerns products that the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants have not manufactured or sold for many years.

3. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek documents and information that would disclose any of the Mitsubishi Electric

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 Defendants' or a third party's trade secrets or other confidential, proprietary, and/or highly-  
2 sensitive information.

3 4. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories to the extent that  
4 they seek disclosure of privileged information, including information protected by the attorney-  
5 client privilege, work-product doctrine, the joint defense privilege, or any other applicable  
6 privilege or immunity. Any inadvertent disclosure of privileged or protected documents,  
7 materials, or information shall not be construed as a waiver of any applicable privileges or  
8 protections.  
9

10 5. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the Interrogatories to the extent that  
11 they seek discovery of information regarding or related to the sale of CRTs or finished products  
12 containing CRTs outside of the United States and unrelated to United States commerce, on the  
13 grounds that they are overbroad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, and not reasonably calculated to  
14 lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.  
15

16 6. In making these responses, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants do not concede the  
17 relevancy or materiality of any of the Plaintiff's Interrogatories.

18 7. Any response contained herein providing that information responsive to a  
19 particular interrogatory will be produced, subject to any applicable objections, is not a  
20 representation that such information exists.  
21

22 8. The responses and/or objections contained herein do not in any way constitute an  
23 adoption of DPPs' purported definitions of words or phrases contained in the Interrogatories.  
24 The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definitions to the extent that they: (i) are vague,  
25 ambiguous, confusing, and/or overly broad; (ii) are inconsistent with the ordinary and customary  
26

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 meaning of the words or phrases they purport to define; and/or (iii) incorporate other purported  
2 definitions that suffer from such defects. Without limiting the breadth and general application of  
3 these objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants further object to the definitions as follows:

- 4 a. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Co-Conspirator” to  
5 the extent it purports to suggest that any of the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants  
6 participated in a price-fixing conspiracy with the parties identified by the Plaintiff or  
7 any of the DPPs.  
8
- 9 b. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Documents” to the  
10 extent it purports to include documents that are not reasonably accessible to any of  
11 the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants, or are beyond the scope of any applicable e-  
12 discovery obligations.  
13
- 14 c. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Communication” on  
15 the grounds that the definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seeks  
16 information that is neither relevant to any claims or defenses in this litigation nor  
17 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.  
18
- 19 d. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants object to the definition of “Meeting” on the  
20 grounds that the definition is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seeks  
21 information that is neither relevant to any claims or defenses in this litigation nor  
22 reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.  
23  
24  
25  
26

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO WETTSTEIN AND SON'S  
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

- 1) When did You first become aware of *In re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC (N.D. Cal.) (the “CRT Action”)?

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state that they first became aware of *In re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC (N.D. Cal.) (the “CRT Action”) in or about January 2009.

- 2) What was Your policy on the destruction and/or retention of Documents and information at the time You learned of the CRT Action?

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants, respectively, state as follows:

MEUS states that in or about January 2009, MEUS had a formal policy governing the retention of documents and information. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), MEUS refers the DPPs to ME 00148433 – ME 00148485.

MEVSA states that in or about January 2009, MEVSA had a formal policy governing the retention of documents and information. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), MEVSA refers the DPPs to ME 00148633– ME 00148686.

MELCO states that in or about January 2009, MELCO had formal corporate rules governing the retention and disposal of documents. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), MELCO refers the DPPs to ME 00148590 – ME 00148613.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

3) What steps did You take to retain Documents and information after learning of the CRT Action?

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state as follows:

All document retention policies applicable to the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants remained in place as of January 2009. The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants did not take further steps to retain documents and information upon first learning of the CRT Action in or about January 2009, as they had no reason to believe they would be named in the CRT Action.

5) What was Your policy on the destruction and/or retention of Documents and information at the time You entered into the Tolling Agreement Between the CRT Class and Mitsubishi Electric Corporation and Mitsubishi Electric and Electronics USA, Inc. (Nov. 7, 2011) (“Tolling Agreement”)?

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein. Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state, respectively, as follows:

MEUS and MEVSA state that after entering into the Tolling Agreement with the DPPs on November 7, 2011, relevant personnel at MEUS and MEVSA were issued a “Suspension and Preservation Notice/Litigation Hold” (“Hold Notice”) on November 11, 2011. The Hold Notice required individuals subject to the Hold Notice to segregate and preserve all business records relating to CRT-based products such as TVs and computer monitors, and to suspend scheduled records destruction of such materials and/or business records. This Hold Notice was timely supplemented during the course of the litigation.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

1 MELCO states that after entering into the Tolling Agreement with the DPPs on  
2 November 7, 2011, relevant personnel at MELCO were issued notice on November 9, 2011  
3 prohibiting the destruction or alteration of CRT-related documents and an extension of the  
4 minimum storage period ("MELCO Litigation Hold"). The MELCO Litigation Hold required  
5 individuals subject to it to segregate and preserve all business records relating to CRTs or CRT-  
6 based products such as TVs and computer monitors and to suspend scheduled records destruction  
7 of such materials and/or business records.  
8

9 6) What steps did You take to retain Documents and information after You entered  
10 into the Tolling Agreement?

11 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants hereby  
12 incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein.  
13 Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants state that for  
14 their supplemental response to this Interrogatory, they hereby incorporate by reference their  
15 supplemental response to DPPs' Interrogatory No. 5.

16 8) Please describe for the period 2005 to the present your systems and/or procedures,  
17 if any, for the automatic deletion of email or other electronically-stored  
18 information.

19 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:** The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants hereby  
20 incorporate by reference their previous objections to this Interrogatory as if set forth fully herein.  
21 Subject to and without waiving those objections, the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants,  
22 respectively, state as follows:

23 MEUS and MEVSA state that during the Relevant Time Period, neither MEUS nor  
24 MEVSA had any systems or procedures for the automatic deletion of emails or other  
25 electronically stored information.  
26



**CONFIDENTIAL**

MELCO states that during the Relevant Time Period MELCO did not have any systems or procedures for the automatic deletion of emails or other electronically stored information.

Dated: July 28, 2015

Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric  
US, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions  
America, Inc.

By: /s/ Michael T. Brody

Michael T. Brody

Terrence J. Truax (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael T. Brody (*pro hac vice*)  
Gabriel A. Fuentes (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
353 North Clark  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456  
Telephone: 312 222-9350  
Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
ttruax@jenner.com  
mbrody@jenner.com  
gfuentes@jenner.com

Brent Caslin (Cal. Bar. No. 198682)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
633 West Fifth Street  
Suite 3600  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213 239-5100  
Facsimile: 213 239-5199  
bcaslin@jenner.com

*Attorneys for Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc., and Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.*

**CONFIDENTIAL****VERIFICATION FOR MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC CORPORATION**

I, Akihiko Moriya, declare and state:

I have read the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants' foregoing Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants and know its contents. The Supplemental Response is limited by the records and information in existence, presently recollected, and thus far discovered in the course of preparation of this Supplemental Response. Based thereon, I am informed and believe that the matters stated in this Supplemental Response are true and on that ground certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the same are true and correct.

Executed this 27<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2015 at Tokyo.

  
[NAME] Akihiko MORIYA

**CONFIDENTIAL****VERIFICATION FOR MEUS AND MEVSA**

I, Yasuhiro Baba, declare and state:

I have read the Mitsubishi Electric Defendants' foregoing Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants and know its contents. The Supplemental Response is limited by the records and information in existence, presently recollected, and thus far discovered in the course of preparation of this Supplemental Response. Based thereon, I am informed and believe that the matters stated in this Supplemental Response are true and on that ground certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the same are true and correct.

Executed this 28th day of July, 2015 at Cypress, California, U.S.A.



Yasuhiro Baba

1 Brent Caslin (Cal. Bar. No. 198682)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
2 633 West Fifth Street  
Suite 3600  
3 Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: 213 239-5100  
4 Facsimile: 213 239-5199  
5 bcaslin@jenner.com

6 Terrence J. Truax (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael T. Brody (*pro hac vice*)  
7 Gabriel A. Fuentes (*pro hac vice*)  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
8 353 North Clark Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60654-3456  
9 Telephone: 312 222-9350  
10 Facsimile: 312 527-0484  
ttruax@jenner.com  
11 mbrody@jenner.com  
gfuentes@jenner.com

12 *Attorneys for Mitsubishi Electric Corporation, Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc., and Mitsubishi*  
13 *Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.*

14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17 In Re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust  
18 Litigation

Case No. 14-cv-2058 SC

MDL No. 1917

19 This Document Relates To:

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

20 DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Certificate of Service**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I caused a true and correct copy of the documents listed below to be served on July 28, 2015 via email to each of the persons as set forth on the attached service list.

- The Mitsubishi Electric Defendants' Supplemental Responses to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Wettstein and Sons, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Mitsubishi Defendants
- Mitsubishi Electric Corporation's Fourth Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Crago, d/b/a, Dash Computer's, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants Mitsubishi, Thomson, and TDA
- Mitsubishi Electric US, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Crago, d/b/a, Dash Computer's, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants Mitsubishi, Thomson, and TDA
- Mitsubishi Electric Visual Solutions America, Inc.'s Second Supplemental Response to Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Crago, d/b/a, Dash Computer's, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to Defendants Mitsubishi, Thomson, and TDA

Dated: July 28, 2015

By: /s/ Jory M. Hoffman  
Jory M. Hoffman

Service List

Philip J. Iovieno  
 Anne M. Nardacci  
 Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP  
 30 South Pearl St., 11th Floor  
 Albany, NY 12207  
 Telephone: (518) 434-0600  
 Facsimile: (518) 434-0665  
 piovieno@bsfllp.com  
 anardacci@bsfllp.com

William Isaacson  
 Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP  
 5301 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Suite 800  
 Washington, D.C. 20015  
 Telephone: (202) 237-2727  
 Facsimile: (202) 237-6131  
 wisaacson@bsfllp.com

Stuart Singer  
 Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP  
 401 East Las Olas Blvd., Suite 1200  
 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
 Telephone: (954) 356-0011  
 Facsimile: (954) 356-0022  
 ssinger@bsfllp.com

*Counsel for Electrograph Systems, Inc.,  
 Electrograph Technologies, Corp., Office  
 Depot, Inc., Interbond Corporation of  
 America, P.C. Richard & Son Long  
 Island Corporation, Marta Cooperative  
 of America, Inc., ABC Appliance, Inc.,  
 Schultze Agency Services LLC on behalf  
 of Tweeter Opco, LLC and Tweeter  
 Newco, LLC*

William J. Blechman  
 Richard A. Arnold  
 Samuel J Randall  
 Kenny Nachwalter PA  
 201 South Biscayne Blvd  
 Suite 1100  
 Miami, FL 33131  
 Telephone: (305) 373-1000  
 Fax: (305) 372-1861  
 wblechman@knpa.com  
 rarnold@kennynachwalter.com  
 srandall@knpa.com

Kevin J. Murray  
 201 S. Biscayne Blvd.  
 Suite 1100  
 Miami, FL 33131  
 Telephone: (305)-373-1000  
 Fax: (305)-372-1861  
 kmurray@knpa.com

Gavin David Whitis  
 Pond North LLP  
 350 South Grand Ave  
 Ste 3300  
 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
 Telephone: (415) 217-1240  
 Fax: (415) 394-0484  
 gwhitis@pondnorth.com

*Counsel for Sears, Roebuck and Co. and KMart  
 Corporation*

<p> Kenneth S. Marks  David M. Peterson  John Pierre Lahad  Johnny William Carter  Jonathan Jeffrey Ross  Susman Godfrey LLP  1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  Houston, TX 77002-5096  Telephone: (713) 651-9366  Fax: (713) 654-6666  kmarks@susmangodfrey.com  dpeterson@susmangodfrey.com  jlahad@susmangodfrey.com  jcarter@susmangodfrey.com  jross@susmangodfrey.com    <i>Counsel for Alfred H. Siegel, as Trustee of  Circuit City Stores, Inc. Liquidating Trust</i> </p>	<p> Roman Silberfeld  David Martinez  Jill Sharon Casselman  Robins Kaplan Miller &amp; Ciresi LLP  2049 Century Park East  Suite 3400  Los Angeles, CA 90067-3208  Telephone: (310) 552-0130  Fax: (310) 229-5800  rmsilberfeld@rkmc.com    dmartinez@rkmc.com  jscasselman@rkmc.com    Elliot S. Kaplan  K. Craig Wildfang  Laura Elizabeth Nelson  Robins Kaplan Miller and Ciresi  2800 LaSalle Plaza  800 LaSalle Ave  Minneapolis, MN 55402  Telephone: (612) 349-0986  Fax: (612) 339-4181  eskaplan@rkmc.com  kcwildfang@rkmc.com  lenelson@rkmc.com    <i>Counsel for Best Buy Co., Inc.; Best Buy  Purchasing LLC; Best Buy Enterprise Services,  Inc.; Best Buy Stores, L.P.; BestBuy.com, LLC;  and Magnolia Hi-Fi, Inc.</i> </p>
<p> Cori Gordon Moore  David Burman  Eric J. Weiss  Nicholas H. Hesterberg  Perkins Coie LLP  1201 Third Avenue  Suite 4800  Seattle, WA 98101-3099  Telephone: (206) 359-8000  Fax: (206) 359-4849  cgmoore@perkinscoie.com  dburman@perkinscoie.com  eweiss@perkinscoie.com  nhesterberg@perkinscoie.com    Joren Surya Bass </p>	<p> Scott N. Wagner  Wendy Polit  Robert Turken  Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price &amp; Axelrod LLP  200 S. Biscayne Boulevard  Suite 2500  Miami, FL 33131  Telephone: 305-350-7386  swagner@bilzin.com  wpolit@bilzin.com  rturken@bilzin.com    <i>Attorneys for Tech Data Corp.</i> </p>

Perkins Coie  
 Four Embarcadero Center  
 Suite 2400  
 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 Telephone: (415) 344-7000  
 jlbass@perkinscoie.com

*Counsel for Costco Wholesale Corporation*

Debra Dawn Bernstein  
 Michael P. Kenny  
 Melissa Whitehead  
 Alston & Bird LLP  
 1201 West Peachtree Street  
 Atlanta, GA 30309  
 404-881-7000  
 Fax: 404-253-8488  
 debra.bernstein@alston.com  
 Mike.Kenny@alston.com  
 Debra.Bernstein@alston.com  
 Melissa.Whitehead@alston.com

James Matthew Wagstaffe  
 Kerr & Wagstaffe LLP  
 101 Missions Street, 18th Floor  
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1528  
 415-371-8500  
 Fax: 415-371-0500  
 Email: wagstaffe@kerrwagstaffe.com

*Attorneys for Dell, Inc., and Dell Products, L.P.*

Guido Saveri  
 Cadio Zirpoli  
 Rick Saveri  
 Saveri & Saveri, Inc.  
 706 Sansome Street  
 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 Telephone: 415-217-6810  
 Fax: 415-217-6813  
 Guido@saveri.com  
 Cadio@saveri.com  
 rick@saveri.com